UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,820	10/07/2004	Robert P. Rouen	68.0496	5819
35204 7590 05/18/2010 SCHLUMBERGER RESERVOIR COMPLETIONS			EXAMINER	
14910 AIRLIN		ANDREWS, DAVID L		
ROSHARON, TX 77583			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3672		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

VSOLIS2@SLB.COM ABrown15@rosharon.oilfield.slb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/711,820	ROUEN, ROBERT P.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	David Andrews	3072	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavieal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ater thán SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the present additional claims. 			ne issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 			·
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		i be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/David J. Bagnell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3672			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill would not arrive at the claimed combination through a combination of McCulloch and Maloney because the valves of Maloney are not gas lift valves, that the combination would make McCulloch inoperable for its intended use (since the addition of valves on member 40 would allededly not allow it to seal properly), and that Maloney teaches that the side string is in contact with the production string. The examiner disagrees with each argument.

The first argument, that Maloney does not teach gas lift valves, has been addressed previously (see Ofice action mailed 3/6/2009). Maloney discloses that the valves (30) are "gas-lift unloading valves" (col. 1, lines 54-58) which allow gas to enter the production string (21) from the tubular (col. 3, lines 30-35) in order to "lift liquid" from the well and that they are set to open at a particular pressure threshold (col. 3, lines 35-37). Therefore, the valves of Maloney are disclosed and considered as gas-lift valves as claimed.

The second argument, that the combination would make McCulloch inoperable for its intended use are not persuasive because the test of obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference, but rather the test is what the combined teachings would suggest to those of ordinary skill in the art.

The third argument, that Maloney teaches the side string in contact with the production string is not persuasive since Maloney is not relied on for this teaching, but rather the primary reference, McCulloch.